

OPPOSITION to HB 6355 *AN ACT CONCERNING RISK PROTECTION ORDERS OR WARRANTS*

To Co-Chair Winfield, Co-Chair Stafstrom, Vice Chair Kasser, Vice Chair Blumenthal and all members of the Judiciary Committee:

I wish to voice my **OPPOSITION** to **HB 6355**.

Connecticut's current extreme risk protection order law is **already adequate**. If **suicides and mass shootings** have been prevented under our current extreme risk warrant law, then **the current law is working**.

When it comes to seizing guns through a petition, the **standards** that a judge uses should be **high**, and should require facts derived from an **investigation**. This bill would remove the need for law enforcement to conduct a **non-biased investigation**.

Former partners, family members, or roommates could use this as a tool of revenge. Why, when ERPOs have been found to be maliciously requested, have you **not** prosecuted those petitioners for **perjury**?

Why would you only allow seized property to be held by police or a federal firearm license dealer instead of by another eligible person, someone who **loves and cares** for the individual at risk? The subject of an extreme risk protection order would incur heavy **costs** and put that person's possessions at risk for **theft, loss, or damage**. This is especially concerning if those firearms are **expensive, rare**, have **historical value**, or are family **heirlooms**.

Under current law, firearms may be returned after twelve months if there were no further claims, actions, or hospitalizations. That should be proof that there is **no longer an "imminent risk"**.

This proposed bill would put the **burden of proof** on the **warranted person**. That is unconscionable and expensive.

Respectfully,

Dr. Walter Kupson

Middlebury, Connecticut